

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Claims 2-13 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are pending with claims 14-20 being withdrawn from further consideration.

The Examiner objected to the Title. A new Title is provided that is deemed descriptive of the invention.

The objection to the claims has been addressed by changing “A method” to “The method” in claims 2-13.

The Examiner objected to the disclosure stating that it does not describe the “terminal enlarging member” of the claims. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner since the “Summary of the Invention”, which is part of the disclosure, describes the terminal enlarging member. In any event, the specification has been amended at pages 5 to recite that the steel stud (104) is an example of a terminal enlarging member. The terminal enlarging member is most preferably formed of a metal or alloy thereof, e.g. a steel rod insert or an inner sleeve, and, most preferably, having a head such as to constitute a stud (104), cap (150) (as shown in Fig. 3), or the like. These features are described also at page 2, lines 25-27 and in particular at lines 28-30.

Page 6 of the specification has also been amended to recite that Fig. 3 shows a cap or sleeve 150 as an example of a terminal enlarging member having a head 152 partly inserted into cable 22 to surround an inner of steel strands 154 and surrounded by outer aluminum strands 156. The cap as a terminal enlarging member is also described at page 2, lines 28-30 of the specification. See also page 3 (e.g., line 14) of the specification providing additional details of the terminal enlarging member. Thus, no new matter has been added by the amendment to the specification and the objection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner objected to the drawings as not showing the “terminal enlarging member”. As noted above, the specification has been amended to recite that the stud (104) and cap (150) are examples of the terminal enlarging member. The stud (104) and cap (150) are clearly shown in the drawings. Thus, Applicant submits that no changes to the drawings are required. With regard to claim 3, the term “rod” has been

change to “stud”. With regard to claim 6, the specification at page 6 has been amended to recite a cap or sleeve (150)”. This change is supported at page 3, line 14 of the specification. Thus, the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph and under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. These rejections are respectfully traversed. The Examiner contends that the stud is “critical or essential to practice the invention”. However, as indicated at page 2, lines 28-30 the stud is merely an example of a terminal enlarging member:

The enlarging member is most preferably formed of a metal or alloy thereof, e.g. a steel rod insert or an inner sleeve, and, most preferably, having a head such as to constitute a stud, cap or the like.

In any event, the term “rod” has been changed to “stud” in claim 3 to be consistent with the disclosure. The sleeve of claim 6 is fully supported by the disclosure at page 3, lines 1-4 and line 14 of the specification. Therefore, the rejections under Section 112 should be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Osteng. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Osteng teaches use of a conical-shaped wedge having a longitudinal central portion and longitudinal circumferential grooves, which receive the central strand internally within and separated, untwisted individual strands externally outside of the wedge. Although the wedge has an enlarged conical terminal bore, only a relatively minor portion of the ends of the strands are “splayed” one from the others. The strands are essentially parallel one to the other, essentially the longitudinal length of the wedge. The wedge is used within a sleeve, which is located within a main connected tube, i.e. a three component system for joining two line ends of conductor lines. In contrast, instant invention requires only two components, namely, a connecting tube and a terminal enlarging member and wherein the strands of the conductor lines are not individually separated and essentially remain in abutment with each other. Further, in the present invention, the conductor strands at their ends are compressed directly and intimately within the connecting tube, per se, which is encased by the explosive line.

In contrast, in Osteng, the connecting tube does not receive the conductor strands directly and intimately but embraces the metal sleeve, which, in turn, embraces the conductor strands.

Claim 1 defines the feature of the ends of the conductor strands being inserted within the connecting tube and is, thus, not anticipated by Osteng.

The Examiner's comment that Osteng discloses or teaches at (b) inserting said ends into a connecting tube, being the same connecting tube as at (d) is not correct. Osteng discloses use of an inner sleeve for receiving the strands associated with the special wedge.

Further, there is no motivation in Osteng for the skilled person in the art to dispense with the specially shaped inner sleeve for use with the specially shaped complementary specially shaped wedge to arrive at instant invention. Accordingly, the skilled person would readily conclude that there is no teaching in Osteng that only a single connector need be used to provide an efficacious joint, in a faster and cheaper manner than prior art methods, while providing a non-slip product.

With regard to claim 13, Osteng does not teach that "each of said first and second portions has a greater thickness than at said interportion distance". In Osteng, portion Ea has a greater thickness than portion E, but there is no portion creating the interportion distance with Ea that has a greater thickness than portion E. Therefore, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osteng. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner contends that it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to choose any desired explosive layer and that the Applicant has not disclosed that these features are patentably distinguishing features.

Claim 13 recites that:

said first and second portions are disposed on the outside surface of said connecting tube such that said interportion surrounds each of said enlarged terminal portions of said ends of said cables and said first and second portion surround said cables adjacent said ends, prior to said detonation, as to effect a greater explosive compaction force onto said cables adjacent

said ends relative to the forces exerted on said terminal portions.
(emphasis added)

Thus, the first and second portions are located and function to effect greater explosive compaction force to the cable adjacent the ends. The first and second portions have a specific relation to the overall structure and the location and function of the portions cannot be ignored by the Examiner or simply determined to be an “obvious matter of design choice”. The Examiner has failed to provide why one of ordinary skill in the art would provide the first and second portions as claimed. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward J. Stemberger
Reg. No. 36,017
Tel. No. 202.261.1014
Fax No. 202.887.0336

Customer No. 20736